



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/755,355

01/05/2001

Robert E. Dvorak

BLFR 1002-1

3933

22470 7590 01/28/2008  
HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP  
P O BOX 366  
HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019

EXAMINER

VAN DOREN, BETH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/28/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/755,355

Applicant(s)

DVORAK ET AL.

Examiner

BETH VAN DOREN

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 39-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 39-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a Final office action in response to communications received 06/26/2007. Claims 1, 39, and 41 have been amended. Claims 1-15 and 39-42 are pending.

#### *Response to Amendment*

2. Applicant's amendments to claims 1, 39, and 41 have overcome the 35 USC 112, second paragraph, rejections set forth below. However, these amendments have raised new 35 USC 112, first paragraph, rejections, which are asserted below.

#### *Response to Arguments*

3. Applicant's arguments with regards to the 35 USC 112, first paragraph, rejections set forth in the previous office action have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, Applicant argues that there is support for "cloning daily sales history data", citing original claim 41 and specification page 4, lines 23 and 31-32.

In response to this argument, examiner respectfully disagrees. See discussion below with respect the 35 USC 112, first paragraph, rejection. Page 2, lines 17-25, of the specification discloses an interval being selected for tracking/monitoring actual sales. Original claim 41 does recite the term daily in the context of the monitoring/tracking interval in daily or more frequent periods. However, this does not support how cloning is accomplished, but rather is an established interval for reviewing sales data. Applicant notes page 4 of the specification. Page 4 recites using actual sales data to search to search for a good, **other than the cloned good**, which more closely matches actual sales of the other good. Again, this does not provide written description for how cloning is accomplished. Therefore, Examiner respectfully maintains that "cloning daily sales history data" was not described in the specification in such a way as to

Art Unit: 3623

reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

4. Applicant's arguments with regards to the rejections based on Beyer et al. (U.S. 6,978,249) have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, Applicant argues that (1) Beyer is concerned with the life-cycle of an individual good, but does not teach anything about day by day inventory demands at a retail level, (2) Beyer does not teach or suggest creating cloned sales history for goods at particular retail locations, scaling cloned sales history data for individual selling retail locations, or rescaling cloned daily sales history data (instead Beyer normalizes and averages), (3) Beyer does not teach or suggest data for particular products at particular locations and that it is clear, since the claim says actual sales data instead of average sales data, that the sales history concerns particular locations rather than regions, (4) as per claims 8-9, Beyer does not teach or suggest a persistent data set that is modified and retained and examiner gave claims 8-9 the same interpretation as 10, 11, 14, and 15, (5) as per claims 10-11 and 14-15, Beyer does not teach or suggest scaling a cloned daily sales history by storing a scaling factor that applies to the discrete data and Beyer's math is entirely different from what Applicant's claim, and (6) with respect to claims 6-7, examiner is confusing passing parameters by value with use of pointers and miscomprehends the use of addressing schemes, and the Applicant respectfully requests an Examiner's Declaration (see page 14 of remarks)

In response to argument (1), Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, as asserted below in the 35 USC 112, first paragraph, rejections, there is not sufficient written description for daily sales being cloned from past daily sales history, and thus this is being construed as cloned sales

Art Unit: 3623

history and past sales history. Second, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., inventory and retail levels) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Beyer et al does disclose that goods are sold at locations and that this actual sales data is tracked. When a new product is to be introduced to market, a cloned good is created based on actually collected sales data of similar products, such as those in the product family. Cloned means to imitate or make a copy. Therefore, the cloned good is an imitation good produced (and not an actual good sold per se). See figures 2 and 4, column 1, lines 30-56, column 2, lines 40-55, column 3, lines 37-55, column 4, lines 1-20 and 40-50, column 8, lines 64-67, wherein sales history data for a product (cloned product) that closely resembles another, new product is associated with this new product

In response to arguments (2) and (3), Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, claim 1 recites sales history data for sales of a cloned good at a plurality of locations. Therefore, the claim does not require particular products at particular locations. In fact the claim uses the term “good” singularly, this good being at a plurality of selling locations. Further, the claim recites “an other good” singularly also with respect to a plurality of selling locations. Nothing recited limits the scope to “particular products at particular locations”. Further, examiner is unclear how the term “actual sales data” limits the claim to such an interpretation. Actual sales data is real sales data, so data that has actually existed. Thus, if a singular product is sold at multiple locations in the past, the real or actually occurring data can be collected and compiled from those multiple locations. Further, see the 35 USC 112, first paragraph, rejection for the interpretation

Art Unit: 3623

of cloned and other goods. See Beyer, figures 2 and 4, column 1, lines 30-56, column 2, lines 40-55, column 3, lines 37-55, column 4, lines 1-20 and 40-50, column 8, lines 64-67, which teaches collecting data for a product.

Second, Beyer et al. does teach scaling when it discloses adjusting the sales history for the new product by using a factor that results in an estimate of demand for the new product. See figure 5, column 4, lines 50-65, column 9, lines 55-65. See figure 5, column 5, lines 25-45, column 9, line 65-column 10, line 30, which discloses rescaling the sales history data based on received demand data to adjust the calculated amount.

In response to argument (4), Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, as asserted above in the 35 USC 112, first paragraph, rejections, there is not sufficient written description for creating cloned daily sales histories and thus this is being construed as cloned sales history. Further, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a persistent data set) is not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The claims never recite that there is a persistent file created and there is no reason, based on the claim language, to construe the history data as such. Beyer et al. does teach rescaling the cloned sales history data based on actual sales of the other good during the interval in figure 5, column 5, lines 25-45, column 9, line 65-column 10, line 30. These areas of Beyer et al. disclose adjusting the sales history data based on received demand data to adjust the calculated amount. Further, figures 2 and 4, column 4, lines 10-20 and 35-67, column 5, lines 25-45, disclose that the associated sales history is modified when associated with the new

Art Unit: 3623

product. Thus, Beyer teaches “modifying the cloned daily sales history data” as required by the claim.

Further, applicant alleges that examiner gave claims 8-9 the same interpretation as 10, 11, 14, and 15. The following are the rejections given by examiner with respect to these claims:

As per claims 8 and 9, Beyer et al. discloses scaling the cloned sales history data including modifying the cloned sales history data (See figures 2 and 4, column 4, lines 10-20 and 35-67, column 5, lines 25-45, wherein the associated sales history is modified when associated with the new product).

As per claims 10, 11, 14, and 15, Beyer et al. discloses wherein scaling and rescaling the cloned sales history data includes storing a scaling factor to be applied to the cloned sales history data (See column 4, lines 21-34 and 55-67, column 7, lines 30-67, column 8, lines 5-35, column 9, lines 20-37, and column 10, lines 20-30, wherein the sales history is scaled and rescaled using factors, such as time, run-rate, and standard deviation).

Note that both the rationale and the areas of art cited are different in each instance.

Therefore, she did not give these claims the same interpretation.

In response to argument (5), Examiner respectfully disagrees. See column 4, lines 21-34 and 55-67, column 7, lines 30-67, column 8, lines 5-35, column 9, lines 20-37, and column 10, lines 20-30, wherein the sales history is scaled and rescaled using factors, such as time, run-rate, and standard deviation. Such a factor is stored in the system and used to scale and rescale the sales history data.

In response to argument (6), Applicant has attempted to challenge the Examiner’s taking of Official Notice. There are minimum requirements for a challenge to Official Notice:

(a) In general, a challenge, to be proper, must contain adequate information or arguments so that *on its face* it creates a reasonable doubt regarding the circumstances justifying the Official Notice

(b) Applicants must seasonably traverse (challenge) the taking of Official Notice as soon as practicable, meaning the next response following an Office Action. If an applicant fails

Art Unit: 3623

to seasonably traverse the Official Notice during examination, his right to challenge the Official Notice is waived. MPEP 2144.03(c)

Examiner first notes that if applicant properly challenges the official notice, she is given the option of providing a reference to support her allegation *or* she can provide a declaration (i.e. she is not required to provide the declaration asserted by Applicant). Second, Applicant has not provided adequate information or arguments so that *on its face* it creates a reasonable doubt regarding the circumstances justifying the Official Notice. Applicant does not provide evidence as to why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. Instead, Applicant states that examiner is confusing passing parameters with the use of pointers (not asserted in the official notice) and miscomprehends addressing schemes, but does not state why this is the case. Examiner is not clear as to what the supposed error is in her Official Notice. Therefore, the presentation of a reference to substantiate the Official Notice is not deemed necessary. The Examiner's taking of Official Notice has been maintained.

5. Applicant's arguments with regards to the rejections based on Beyer et al. in view of Ando (U.S. 6,032,125) have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, Applicant argues that (7) Ando does not teach or suggest rescaling repeatedly on a predetermined cycle and that neither reference teaches the underlying technique of rescaling cloned daily sales history.

In response to argument (7), Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, rescaling cloned daily sales history has been addressed in the arguments above. Beyer et al. further teaches wherein the rescaling takes place after the interval without intervention of a user. See column 3,



Art Unit: 3623

lines 53-57, column 5, lines 25-45, wherein the forecasting system, including the updating module, operates without human intervention. Ando was relied upon to disclose rescaling/reconsidering the data repeatedly on a predetermined cycle beginning at the end of the interval. See figures 3, 4, and 7, column 2, lines 1-20, 30-40, and line 66-column 3, line 3, column 4, lines 20-30, column 6, lines 55-65, wherein the scaling occurs to deal with fluctuations that occur with respect to demand predictions. Ando is specifically concerned with repeated model optimization based on demand fluctuation. Thus, Ando does teach and suggest rescaling repeatedly on a predetermined cycle.

6. Applicant's arguments with regards to the rejections based on Beyer et al. in view of Singh (U.S 7,080,026) have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, Applicant argues that (8) the provisional of Singh (60/243,425) does not support the non-provisional and therefore Singh does not qualify as prior art, and (9) Singh does not teach or suggest comparing the actual sales to the sales history data for a set of candidate goods and evaluating whether the sales history of one or more of the candidate goods better matches said actual sales than the cloned daily sales history data, and (10) examiner makes a conclusory assertion concerning the combination of Beyer and Singh.

In response to argument (8), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant has not provided evidence of how the provisional application of Singh does not support the rejection asserted by the examiner. Applicant alleges on page 16 of the remarks that the Singh provisional does not support the Singh non-provisional relied upon by Examiner, but has not cited any specific deficiencies or sections that are not supported. Examiner has properly established a prima facie

Art Unit: 3623

case of obviousness and Applicant has not provided specific arguments to challenge her position.

Therefore, examiner maintains her rejection.

In response to argument (9), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Singh et al. was relied upon to teach comparing product forecasts and sales to other related products to adjust the forecasts. Singh discloses taking available history data and based on comparisons, choosing the best data for the situation to perform forecasting. Data is updated on an ongoing basis to adjust forecasts by identifying better and more applicable data. Singh discloses establishing demand groups. This allows product forecasts and sales to be compared to other related products to adjust the forecasts. See column 3, line 50-column 4, line 5 and line 65-column 5, line 7, column 6, lines 35-60, column 13, lines 40-55, column 15, lines 50-65, column 17, lines 20-31 and line 59-column 18, line 5). Thus, Singh was not relied on to teach cloned or other goods, but the concept of iterative tuning and the ability to compare actual sales data within a demand group to better forecast demand.

In response to argument (10), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner reminds applicant that KSR has foreclosed the argument that a specific teaching, suggestion, or motivation is required to support a finding of obviousness. Examiner has laid out what each reference teaches. First, Beyer et al. discloses storing sales history data for goods as associated when the goods are in a product family, where the product family shares certain life-cycle characteristics, such as monthly demand profiles. Beyer et al. also discloses grouping a new product with a product family before any sales data is known about the product and then comparing the new product with the product family as actual sales data is collected. Singh et al. discloses comparing product forecasts and actual sales with related products in the same demand

Art Unit: 3623

groups. Therefore, this is analogous prior art, both reasonably pertinent to the problem solved.

The motivation provided by examiner is consistent with the teachings of both references.

7. Applicant's arguments with regards to the rejections based on Beyer et al. in view of Singh and in further view of Ando (U.S. 6,032,125) have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, Applicant argues that (11) Ando does not teach daily or monthly forecasting.

In response to argument (11), Examiner respectfully disagrees. See specifically column 2, line 65-column 3, line 5, which discusses daily forecasting. Since Ando and Beyer et al. both disclose demand forecasting for a product using a profile of historic data, wherein the forecasts are reanalyzed an updated over time intervals and Ando discloses forecasting and learning/adjusting on forecasting periods such as daily, the combination of these references, along with Singh, do teach and suggest the limitations.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 1-15 and 39-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the

Art Unit: 3623

relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1-15 recite “cloning daily sales history data”. However, examiner is unable to find support in the specification for this limitation. The summary of the invention on page 1, lines 13-20, and the detailed description, page 1, line 28-page 2, line 7, disclose cloning goods sales history data. However, there is no mention of this sales history data being daily (or of any specific timeframe for that matter). The only place timeframes are discussed are on page 2, lines 17-25, which discloses an interval being selected for tracking/monitoring actual sales. The only place that the term daily appears is in original claim 41, which states that the monitoring/tracking interval is daily or more frequent periods. However, even if this was incorporated into the specification, there is still no implication that the sales history data is cloned in daily increments. As an example, if a retail store maintained and forecasted weekly sales data, the store could still monitor actual data daily to see the progress towards the weekly totals. Therefore, Examiner respectfully submits that “cloning daily sales history data” was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Further, Claim 1 recites “cloning daily sales history data for sales of a cloned good at a plurality of selling locations from actual daily sales history data of an other good sold at the plurality of selling locations”, “scaling the cloned daily sales history data upward or downward based on anticipated sales of the cloned good”, “tracking actual sales of the cloned good for an interval”, and “rescaling the cloned sales history data based on actual sales of the cloned good during the interval”. Thus, the claim recites that data for a cloned good is cloned from the actual

Art Unit: 3623

data of an “other good”. The claim then goes on to recite that the actual data of the cloned good is tracked and used to rescale the associated data. Thus, the claim recites that the other good is a known good with known sales data and it is the cloned good that is supplied with sales history data, scaled, tracked, and rescaled. This seems to contradict the specification, which states on pages 1-2 that sales history data for sales of a cloned good is associated with an other good (that lacks a sales history), that the associated sales history data is scaled based on anticipated sales of the other good, that the actual sales of the other good is tracked and that the associated sales history data is rescaled based on the actual sales data collected. Thus, the specification states that the cloned good is the food with actual sales history data and that the “other good” is a “new, other good”, where “a sales history for a new good, lacking its own sales history, can be created from a cloned good” (specification, page 1, line 29-page 2, line 2). Therefore, Examiner respectfully submits that cloning daily sales history data for sales of a cloned good from actual daily sales history data of an other good, scaling the cloned daily sales history data based on anticipated sales of the cloned good, tracking actual sales of the cloned good, and rescaling the cloned sales history data based on actual sales of the cloned good was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Examiner construes, for examination purposes, that the other good of the claim is meant to be the cloned good of the specification and vice versa. Clarification is required.

Claims 2-15 depend from claim 1 and therefore contain the same deficiencies

Claim 39 recites similar limitations to claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons set forth above.

Art Unit: 3623

Claims 40-42 depend from claim 39 and therefore contain the same deficiencies.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 1, 2, and 8-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Beyer et al. (U.S. 6,978,249).

As per claim 1, Beyer et al. teaches a computer implemented method of supplying a sales history for a good lacking a sales history, including:

cloning sales history data for sales of an other good at a plurality of selling locations from actual daily sales history data of a good sold (i.e. cloned good) at the plurality of selling locations (See figures 2 and 4, column 1, lines 30-56, column 2, lines 40-55, column 3, lines 37-55, column 4, lines 1-20 and 40-50, column 8, lines 64-67, wherein sales history data for a product that closely resembles another, new product is associated with this new product);

scaling the cloned sales history data upward or downward based on anticipated sales of the other good (See figure 5, column 2, lines 50-67, column 4, lines 50-65, column 9, lines 55-65, wherein the sales history data is adjusted to calculated expected sales);

Art Unit: 3623

tracking actual sales of the other good for an interval (See column 1, lines 30-56, column 5, lines 25-45, column 9, line 65-column 10, line 30, wherein actual sales and demand are tracked over an interval); and

rescaling the cloned sales history data based on actual sales of the other good during the interval (See figure 5, column 5, lines 25-45, column 9, line 65-column 10, line 30, which discloses rescaling the sales history data based on received demand data to adjust the calculated amount).

As per claim 2, Beyer et al. teaches wherein the rescaling takes place after the interval without intervention of a user (See column 3, lines 53-57, column 5, lines 25-45, wherein the forecasting system, including the updating module, operates without human intervention).

As per claims 8 and 9, Beyer et al. discloses scaling the cloned sales history data including modifying the cloned sales history data (See figures 2 and 4, column 4, lines 10-20 and 35-67, column 5, lines 25-45, wherein the associated sales history is modified when associated with the new product).

As per claims 10, 11, 14, and 15, Beyer et al. discloses wherein scaling and rescaling the cloned sales history data includes storing a scaling factor to be applied to the cloned sales history data (See column 4, lines 21-34 and 55-67, column 7, lines 30-67, column 8, lines 5-35, column 9, lines 20-37, and column 10, lines 20-30, wherein the sales history is scaled and rescaled using factors, such as time, run-rate, and standard deviation).

As per claims 12 and 13, Beyer et al. discloses rescaling the cloned sales history data including modifying the cloned sales history data (See figure 5, column 5, lines 25-45, column 9,

Art Unit: 3623

line 65-column 10, line 30, wherein the rescaling modifies data associated with the original sales history to generate an updated sales plan for the new product).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beyer et al. (U.S. 6,798,249) in view of Ando (U.S. 6,032,125).

As claim 3, Beyer et al. discloses wherein the rescaling takes place after new data becomes available (See figure 5, column 5, lines 25-45, column 9, line 65-column 10, line 30). Beyer et al. further teaches wherein the rescaling takes place after the interval without intervention of a user (See column 3, lines 53-57, column 5, lines 25-45, wherein the forecasting system, including the updating module, operates without human intervention). However, Beyer et al. does not expressly disclose that the rescaling takes place repeatedly on a predetermined cycle beginning at the end of the interval.

Ando discloses wherein rescaling/reconsidering the data repeatedly on a predetermined cycle beginning at the end of the interval (See figures 3, 4, and 7, column 2, lines 1-20, 30-40, and line 66-column 3, line 3, column 4, lines 20-30, column 6, lines 55-65, wherein the scaling occurs).



Both Ando and Beyer et al. disclose demand forecasting for a product using a profile of historic data. Both the systems are computer-implemented. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the updates of Beyer et al. occur in predetermined cycles, such as the predetermined assessments of Ando, in order to increase the speed to action of the system by causing the assessments to occur on a definable, on-going basis. See column 2, lines 1-20 and 30-40, which discloses the precision of repeated model optimization based on demand fluctuation.

14. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beyer et al. (U.S. 6,798,249) in view of Crosswhite (U.S. 6,611,726).

As per claims 4 and 5, Beyer et al. teaches wherein cloning sales history data includes retrieving the sales history data (See column 4, lines 10-20 and 34-41, column 5, lines 40-67, column 6, lines 20-35, wherein the data is extracted). However, Beyer et al. does not expressly disclose that this sales history data is copied.

Crosswhite discloses forecasting using historical data, such as prior product demand, wherein a copy of the located historical data is retrieved (See column 8, lines 27-35 and line 55-column 9, line 25, wherein a copy of the data associated with the forecast is retrieved).

Both Crosswhite and Beyer et al. disclose using historical sales data concerning a product to perform forecasting, where the sales data is retrieved from a database. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to retrieve a copy of the data (instead of the data itself) in order to increase the integrity of the originally stored data by only manipulating a copy of such data, thus increasing the chance that the retrieved data is

Art Unit: 3623

representative of normal data, containing no data anomalies. See column 9, lines 15-35, which discuss flaws in retrieved data.

15. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beyer et al. (U.S. 6,798,249).

As per claims 6-7, Beyer et al. teaches wherein cloning sales history data includes retrieving the sales history data (See column 4, lines 10-20 and 34-41, column 5, lines 40-67, column 6, lines 20-35, wherein the data is extracted). However, Beyer et al. does not expressly disclose that this sales history data is retrieved using a reference or a pointer.

Beyer et al. discloses using historical sales data concerning a product to perform forecasting, where the sales data is retrieved from a database. Examiner takes official notice that it is old and well known in the programming arts that a reference is a small object containing information which refers to data elsewhere, as opposed to containing the data itself. Further, Examiner takes official notice that it is old and well known in the programming arts that pointers are a specific type of reference whose values are used to refer to ("point to") another value stored elsewhere in computer memory. Both pointers and references have the known benefits of being able to manipulate references to data without actually having to modify the data itself. Further, pointers and references increase flexibility in where objects can be stored, how they are allocated, and how they are passed between areas of code, making the sharing of data between different code areas easier. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use references and pointers to retrieve the data from the

Art Unit: 3623

databases in Beyer et al. in order to increase the flexibility of the system based on the known benefits of pointers and references, discussed above.

16. Claims 39 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beyer et al. (U.S. 6,798,249) in view of Singh et al. (U.S. 7,080,026).

Claim 39 recites equivalent limitations to claim 1 and therefore is rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above in the rejection of claim 1. Beyer et al. further discloses comparing the actual sales of the good to the sales history data of the cloned good (See column 5, lines 25-45, column 7, lines 54-67, column 9, line 65-column 10, line 30). Beyer et al. further discloses grouping products into product families with similar historical demand patterns (See column 3, lines 39-56, column 7, lines 54-67, wherein products are grouped into product families). However, Beyer et al. does not expressly disclose comparing the actual sales to the sales history data for a set of candidate goods and evaluating whether the sales history of one or more of the candidate goods better matches said actual sales.

Singh et al. discloses comparing product forecasts and sales to other related products to adjust the forecasts (See column 3, line 50-column 4, line 5 and line 65-column 5, line 7, column 6, lines 35-60, column 7, lines 20-35, column 8, lines 25-35, which discloses comparing product forecasts to other related products. See also column 13, lines 40-55, column 15, lines 50-65, column 17, lines 20-31 and line 59-column 18, line 5).

Beyer et al. discloses storing sales history data for goods as associated when the goods are in a product family. Beyer et al. further discloses that this product family shares certain life-cycle characteristics, such as monthly demand profiles. Beyer et al. also discloses grouping a

Art Unit: 3623

new product with a product family before any sales data is known about the product and then comparing the new product with the product family as actual sales data is collected. Singh et al. discloses comparing product forecasts and actual sales with related products in the same demand groups. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to compare the new product with another product family and evaluate whether there is a good that better matches the new good in order to more accurately forecast for items in the future by ensuring that like products are grouped together.

As per claim 42, Beyer et al. discloses wherein the comparing and evaluating take place after the actual sales interval, without intervention of the user (See figure 5 and column 3, lines 53-57, column 5, lines 25-45, column 9, line 65-column 10, line 30, wherein the forecasting system, including the updating module, operates without human intervention).

17. Claims 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beyer et al. (U.S. 6,798,249) in view of Singh et al. (U.S. 7,080,026) in further view of Ando (U.S. 6,032,125).

As per claim 40, Beyer et al. discloses tracking actual sales of the other good for an interval (See column 1, lines 30-56, column 5, lines 25-45, column 9, line 65-column 10, line 30, wherein actual sales and demand are tracked over an interval). However, Beyer et al. does not expressly disclose that the actual sales interval includes a plurality of causal periods and evaluating takes place on a causal period by causal period basis. Singh et al. discloses causal factors (See at least column 3, line 55-column 4, line 5, column 8, lines 60-67), but does not expressly disclose sales intervals evaluated on a causal period by causal period basis.

Art Unit: 3623

Ando discloses a sales interval with a plurality of sales intervals that are evaluated on a causal period by causal period basis (See figures 3, 4, and 7, column 2, lines 1-20, 30-40, and line 66-column 3, line 3, column 4, lines 20-30, column 6, lines 55-65, wherein the forecast is broken down into shorter periods for evaluation).

Beyer et al. discloses storing sales history data for goods as associated when the goods are in a product family. Beyer et al. further discloses that this product family shares certain life-cycle characteristics, such as monthly demand profiles. Beyer et al. also discloses grouping a new product with a product family before any sales data is known about the product and then comparing the new product with the product family as actual sales data is collected. Singh et al. discloses comparing product forecasts and actual sales with related products in the same demand groups. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to compare the new product with another product family and evaluate whether there is a good that better matches the new good in order to more accurately forecast for items in the future by ensuring that like products are grouped together.

Further, Both Ando and Beyer et al. disclose demand forecasting for a product using a profile of historic data. Both the systems are computer-implemented. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the updates of Beyer et al. occur in predetermined cycles, such as the predetermined assessments of Ando, in order to increase the speed to action of the system by causing the assessments to occur on a definable, on-going basis. See column 2, lines 1-20 and 30-40, which discloses the precision of repeated model optimization based on demand fluctuation.

Art Unit: 3623

As per claim 41, Beyer et al. discloses tracking actual sales of the other good for an interval and evaluating takes place on this interval basis (See column 1, lines 30-56, column 5, lines 25-45, column 9, line 65-column 10, line 30, wherein actual sales and demand are tracked over an interval). However, neither Beyer et al. nor Singh et al. disclose that this actual interval is daily or more frequent periods.

Ando discloses an actual interval that is short/daily (See column 2, line 65-column 3, line 5, wherein daily forecasting occurs).

Beyer et al. and Singh et al. are combinable for the reasons set forth above. Further, both Ando and Beyer et al. disclose computer implemented systems that perform demand forecasting for a product using a profile of historic data, wherein the forecasts are reanalyzed an updated over time intervals. Ando discloses forecasting and learning/adjusting on forecasting periods such as daily. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a daily interval as the actual interval for reassessment in order to increase the speed to action of the system by causing the assessments to occur on a definable, on-going basis. See column 2, lines 1-20 and 30-40, which discloses the precision of repeated model optimization based on demand fluctuation.

### *Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**

Art Unit: 3623

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BETH VAN DOREN whose telephone number is (571)272-6737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 571-272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Bvd  
January 17, 2008

  
BETH VAN DOREN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER